

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**September 17, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair**

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff

**B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

- 1. Applicant's Name: A-1 Roofing**  
Property Address: 10 S. Reed Avenue  
Date of Approval: August 26, 2008  
Project Install new roof to match existing: 3 tab shingles, black in color
- 2. Applicant's Name: Mark Browning/Browning Consulting, Inc.**  
Property Address: 1312 Chamberlain Avenue  
Date of Approval: August 26, 2008  
Repair rotten siding, skirt board, column bases and windows matching the existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint the repairs and house the existing color scheme.
- 3. Applicant's Name: Neon Zone for Hallmark Petroleum**  
Property Address: 1507 Springhill Avenue  
Date of Approval: August 27, 2008  
Install three signs per the submitted plans. UDD has stated a variance is not required.
- 4. Applicant's Name: Denise and Mark Burks**  
Property Address: 10 S. Monterey  
Date of Approval: August 29, 2008  
Replace rotten wood as necessary on siding with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint house in existing color scheme.
- 5. Applicant's Name: Paige Drew**  
Property Address: 112 Ryan Ave.  
Date of Approval: 3 September 2008  
Repaint exterior in the following color scheme—body, cloud white; window trim, light blue; repaint porch deck per existing. Replace rotten wood as necessary.
- 6. Applicant's Name: Joseph Pierce**  
Property Address: 1110 Montauk Ave.  
Date of Approval: 3 September 2008  
Reroof one story porch to match main house, Certeed shingles, Spanish Tile in color.
- 7. Applicant's Name: Joe Jordan**  
Property Address: 401 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 4 September 2008  
Board second story windows using existing green boards currently set inside the sash, remove them to exterior to fully protect window sashes from the elements. Paint first story storefront boards one consistent color.

## C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 129-08-CA: 116 Kilmarnock**  
Applicant: Dowartha Davis  
Request: Replace illegal chain link fence with appropriate fence.
- 2. 130-08-CA: 8 Semmes Avenue**  
Applicant: Michael D. Rodriguez  
Request: Construct a 6' wood privacy fence.
- 3. 131-08-CA: 1573 Fearnway**  
Applicant: Ben Cummings for Bradley Todd and Linda Collins Jensen  
Request: Removal of rear deck and construction of rear addition, screened porch and arbor.
- 4. 132-08-CA: 1616 Government Street**  
Applicant: Harry Dodich for World Gym  
Request: Application for approval of signage
- 5. 133-08-CA: 809 Government Street**  
Applicant: Robert T. Beach for Mobile Housing Board  
Request: Powerwash, caulk and waterproof/seal exterior exposed masonry walls.
- 6. 134-08-CA: 412 Dauphin Street**  
Applicant: JTB Group, Inc.  
Request: Add balconies to north and west elevations identical/similar to existing balconies on south elevation

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**129-08-CA:** 116 Kilmarnock (vacant lot)  
**Applicant:** Dowartha Davis  
**Received:** 08/26/08  
**Meeting:** 09/17/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Vacant lot; now resubdivided to include a contributing property  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Replace illegal chain link fence with appropriate fencing

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is a vacant lot which has been resubdivided to include 117 N Catherine Street, which has a contributing residence on it.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Applicants own a double lot; their residence fronts N Catherine Street and backyard includes a vacant lot which fronts Kilmarnock Street. Applicants were cited for an inappropriate chain link fence in a historic district.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines for fences states the following: “Fences should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet. . . .”
- C. Applicants wish to replace the existing chain link:
  - 1. with a 6’ wood privacy fence beyond the 25’ of the Kilmarnock Street setback;
  - 2. within the 25’ setback, the homeowners intend to use black aluminum fencing.
- D. Clarifications:
  - 1. What will the top be?
  - 2. How tall will the aluminum black fence be?
  - 3. What is the design for the wood privacy fence?

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The applicants have been advised by Staff and have chosen two fences (wood privacy and black aluminum fencing) routinely approved by this Board. The applicants have been advised either the finial or flat-top aluminum fencing is appropriate, not the crimped.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**130-08-CA:** 8 Semmes Avenue  
**Applicant:** Michael D. Rodriguez  
**Received:** 09/02/08  
**Meeting:** 09/17/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Construct 6' wood privacy fence along rear property line and part of the south property line.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This residence, an American Four Square design from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century with neo-classical revival elements, is a contributing residential structure in the Old Dauphin Way historic district.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The applicant’s home is a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way District; it is presently surrounded by privacy fences on the north and part of the south property line. The property also has its own gated driveway with a six-foot, dog-eared, privacy fence.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines for fences states the following: “Fences should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet. . . .”
- C. The owner seeks approval to construct a 6’ wood privacy fence:
  - 1. 50’ along the east (rear) property line and
  - 2. part of the south property line, approximately 75’.
- D. The fence will be identical in size and design to adjoining fences.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The board routinely approves requests such as these and staff sees no problem with the request.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**131-08-CA: 1573 Fearnway**  
**Applicant: Ben Cummings for Bradley Todd and Linda Collins Jensen**  
**Received: 08/22/08**  
**Meeting: 09/17/08**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way District  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Removal of existing rear deck (non-historic) and construction of rear addition, screened porch and arbor; renovation to existing, non-historic garage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is a contributing residence in the Fearnway subdivision of Old Dauphin Way.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This cross-gabled, English Cottage revival, masonry residence in the Fearnway neighborhood of the Old Dauphin Way District, is a contributing building. The building has undergone a couple of additions/change to the rear.
- B. The Guidelines state, “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The applicant is proposing:
  - a. to remove an existing rear deck and expand an existing board and batten shed addition to the house;
    - i. Addition to board and batten shed, approximately 6’ by 9’
    - ii. Exterior will match existing board and batten
    - iii. Wood windows will match existing
  - b. Shorten existing double set of 6/6 windows to accommodate interior changes and replace with triple set of 6/6 windows to match existing
  - c. Construct a new screened porch in roughly same location of the existing deck;
  - d. Construct an arbor to adjoin the new screened porch and existing garage.
  - e. Replace doors and windows in garage
    - i. new wood windows to match existing
    - ii. remove two existing garage doors and replace with one garage door and one regular door
- D. Clarifications

- a. How board and batten shed addition will attach to original corner of the house?

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed work will take place in areas of the home not in the public view and which have already experienced changes over the years; furthermore, the cinder block garage is a later addition to the property.

Staff recommends the bracket at the corner of the southwest corner where the addition will extend to remain exposed. Staff sees no problem with the scale of the addition and materials being used as long as the windows and doors match the existing historic materials in materials, design and size. Staff recommends the applicant recycle the wooden window in the existing east wall of the board and batten addition, as well as the two being removed from the east wall (as necessary). Staff further recommends the applicant recycle the roofing tiles which will be displaced by the addition and retain for later repairs to the roof, if any.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**132-08-CA: 1616 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Harry Dodich for World Gym**  
**Received: 08/25/08**  
**Meeting: 09/17/08**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way District  
Classification: Non-contributing  
Zoning: B-3  
Project: Install signage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This applicant is a tenant in part of a multi-tenant, non-contributing building adjacent to the Old Dauphin Way District.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This is a non-contributing building located outside the Old Dauphin Way District, but falls within the ordinance for signage along government street.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street read, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors. . .
  - 2. Owner shall submit an overall sign plan addressing placement, materials, and design. Signage for the building and for the tenants shall be consistent. . .
  - 3. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
  - 4. Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
- C. Applicants request signage for the building:
  - a. Applicant has installed a 4’ by 15’9” aluminum sign with plastic faces which is internally lit with fluorescent lights.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The sign does not exceed its allowable size, however, because it is an internally lit, plastic-faced sign, it does not conform to the sign guidelines and should be denied.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**133-08-CA: 809 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Robert Beach for Mobile Housing Board**  
**Received: 08/18/08**  
**Meeting: 09/17/08**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-2  
Project: Powerwash, repoint, and waterproof/seal exposed masonry walls.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this commercial building was constructed in the late 19th century. In the early 1900s, the building housed a pharmacy with a residence on the second floor.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This building is a two-story, late nineteenth century masonry, commercial building. The applicants request a COA to do maintenance on the front façade, which has an exposed masonry wall. The applicants also want approval to cap the parapet.
- B. In regards to masonry, the Mobile Historic Districts Design Review Guidelines reads: “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material. Particular care must be taken with masonry. Consult with staff concerning the mortar mixture for re-pointing historic brick. Bricks and mortar should match the original in color, finish (strike) and thickness.”
- C. The applicant wishes to use modern day techniques to weatherproof the front façade of an exposed masonry late nineteenth century building. The scope of work includes
  - 1. powerwashing the exterior of the building
  - 2. caulk all exterior cracks
  - 3. repoint all missing or defective mortar joints
  - 4. apply two coats of Hydrozo Water Repellent Systems Enviroseal 40
  - 5. Install white aluminum 26 gauge formed coping to cover the stone parapet
- D. Clarifications
  - a. Existing material of the parapet cap and
  - b. Treatment of the parapet which has an intricate, multi-layered cornice.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**



A site visit by Staff revealed the powerwashing and repointing of the front façade has already taken place. Staff would like further clarification pertaining to the parapet and any remaining repointing planned.

The National Park Service explains that “Most historic masonry buildings, unless they are painted, have survived for decades without a water-repellent coating and, thus, probably do not need one now. Water penetration to the interior of a masonry building is seldom due to porous masonry, but results from poor or deferred maintenance. Leaking roofs, clogged or deteriorated gutters and downspouts, missing mortar, or cracks and open joints around door and window openings are almost always the cause of moisture-related problems in a historic masonry building. If historic masonry buildings are kept watertight and in good repair, water-repellent coatings should not be necessary.” Furthermore, “In most instances, **waterproof coatings should not be applied to historic masonry.** The possible exception to this might be the application of a waterproof coating to below-grade exterior foundation walls as a last resort to stop water infiltration on interior basement walls. Generally, however, waterproof coatings, which include *elastomeric paints*, should almost never be applied above grade to historic masonry buildings.” Therefore, the staff recommends the applicant not apply the Hydrozo Water Repellent sealer to this building and the application for this portion of the work be denied.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**134-08-CA: 412 Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: Tillmon Brown for JTB Group**  
**Received: 08/14/08**  
**Meeting: 09/03/08**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Add balconies to the North and West elevations identical to existing balconies on the south elevation

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This project concerns the Old Mattress Factory Building – a three-story, masonry, storefront and warehouse from the early-twentieth century. A contributing building in the Lower Dauphin Street District, this project has been before the board on numerous occasions as it has undergone renovation.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This building has been under renovation for some time and has been before the board for numerous occasions. The Board has approved the balconies currently in place.
- B. The Guidelines state, “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The applicant wishes to install three balcony units on the north face of the building and one additional balcony unit on the west face of the building. The balconies will be identical in form and material to those already in place on the west and south elevations; however, these units will be freestanding and not attach to the others.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The Board approved the balconies on the north elevation at a prior meeting. Since these balconies do not deviate in theme from those already in place, the staff sees no problem with this application.